

7/28/77

Dear Paul,

Your letter of the 25th came today.

You are as entitled to your views on the melonry and Alvarez paper as I am to mine.

The government did put out government cash on Alvarez paper. I have the proofs.

I don't think I said there is a direct connection with the suit vs ERDA. I do say there is a remarkable coincidence in time. And I do know that the timing was planned in advance.

You find as an example of my unwarranted conclusions that he would ask me for a free copy. "Not at all peculiar" are the words you used.

My belief is that I would not be alone in using other words.

You have no scholarly questions about his use as a source of someone else's verbal representations of the work of still another? Happily you practise a higher standard with your own scholarship.

I have no trouble believing his interest came from students in 1966. I don't believe I said otherwise in the letter. You here refer to a "general controversy." I recall no other work containing that content of Whitewash available at that time. So the students got it from Whitewash.

You are correct if you believe you could not convince me that it makes no difference where a shot hit a melon. I do not address this with a degree in physics. I have recollections enough of practical applications from my boyhood. Like with balls. Grown people, golf balls. Tennis balls. Baseballs.

I have no interest in the melonry, you can be assured. I was asking for no information on it.

I am interested in the use made.

But as I recall this is not where I began. That was with the propriety of Alvarez using federal money allocated for research into ^{energy} ~~energy~~ for so obvious a political purpose. My questions now are greater, not fewer.

I also believe that on an article of this nature there is no possible disclaimer once the source of support is stated.

Sincerely,